

*Criminal Code*

whom I represent, the procedure imposed by the government would make me vote at the same time in favour of abortion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this would be flagrantly inconsistent with all statements which I have made in this house. I cannot, with a clear conscience, vote on the bill as a whole, if it is not subdivided. Why? Because we of the opposition have had nothing to say regarding the planning of this procedure and particularly because the bill, as everybody knows, has much more serious implications than one might think at the social, family, economic, human and, finally, moral levels.

We must consider these implications before voting, and we should have the possibility of making a separate decision on each of the various aspects of the bill. We have not had the chance to do it yet, since, to date, the house has only managed to reach a decision on the amendments to the bill and not on the bill itself.

At the third reading stage, I had decided to speak to the house quite objectively.

• (5:30 p.m.)

First of all, we are rejecting abortion. Nobody, not even the minister, has no longer any doubts about this, for approving abortion, in my opinion, is no answer. Those who favour abortion are much more concerned with its social, psychological and economic aspects than with its therapeutic implications as the minister would have it. Even in the therapeutic field the bill is supposed to cover, it goes further still than what the minister suggests: for it has social, psychological and economic implications. The case of the unmarried mother, for instance, of rape, of incest, of alcoholism, of backward couples, of those who are unaware of birth control means or for whom these means have not worked, of couples whose income is too low to allow them the burden of another child, of the problem couples, of the pregnant, discouraged mother overwhelmed by the burden of a large family, of the woman who simply refuses to have another child because it will jeopardize her future career or her present job. And we have also the case of people simply refusing to accept a child because they want more social amenities. These are so many cases, overlooked by this bill, these are so many problems to which it gives no answer.

But let us ask ourselves whether the passage of this legislation will settle the problem in all the cases I just mentioned or if it is not going to make it worse.

It is a known fact—and statistics prove it—that from 50,000 to 80,000 illegal abortions are performed each year in Canada. Now, we must ask ourselves if passing this legislation will solve the problem of clandestine abortions or at least reduce it. One must admit that there is much cause for perplexity, as far as the effects of this bill are concerned, since it does not suggest any effective solution to the clandestine abortion problem nor to the other cases I mentioned earlier.

If the legislator sincerely wishes to reduce the number of clandestine abortions, and ensure respect for life and the human being, he will not achieve the respect for life through the passage of obscure half-measures such as these, left to everybody's free interpretation. The solution lies in going to the root of the problems. We must discourage abortion by getting down efficiently and with determination to the real problems.

Abortion is not a solution in itself. What is regrettable, in my opinion, is that with this bill the Canadian people are under the impression that abortion is a solution, while to me, it would likely increase the problem.

There is only one way to deal with the problem in all the cases I have mentioned. It is not abortion, as the minister would have us believe, and I shall try to explain why quickly.

First, we should see to it that the education of our society is ensured and we should pass legislation intended to protect the family and the child to be born. Instead of putting in people's head the idea that their problem could be settled simply by getting rid of a child who would be a drag on them, let us participate in their education in order to build a better society based on sound values. Let us teach them that a child is not a charge nor a calamity but rather a desirable thing upon which we must build our society.

It is important first to instill into them a sense of well-balanced sexuality and a sense of love but not as it is presented in the movies, in novels and in advertising. I have noticed that for several members abortion represents a very weak aspect of a poorly-balanced sexuality while in fact abortion is rather a problem which is added to the others facing the Canadian family.

Love must not be considered as a series of short-lived adventures as the abortion proposal seems to infer: Let us enjoy life, let us play today without any respect for the human person and tomorrow let us kill. It is not on such a concept of morality that we shall build